



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/695,937

10/30/2003

Hiroyuki Nagano

024016-00073

6281

4372 7590 02/23/2007
ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 400
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

LAYNO, BENJAMIN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3711

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

02/23/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 10/695,937		Applicant(s) NAGANO, HIROYUKI	
Examiner Benjamin H. Layno		Art Unit 3711	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/13/04, 4/19/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

Best Available Copy

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fujii.

The patent to Fujii discloses a gaming machine comprising a cabinet B with an opening. A door 2 is rotatably attached to one side of the cabinet. The door opens and closes the cabinet. A hinge construction, Figs. 5 and 8, rotatably supports the door at the one side of the cabinet. The hinge construction includes an upper support member 22b arranged at an upper position in the one side of the cabinet, and a lower support member 22b arranged at a lower position in the one side of the cabinet. A long shaft member 23 having an upper end and a lower end is rotatably retained in the door. The upper end of the shaft member is rotatably supported in the upper support member, and the lower end of the shaft member is rotatably supported in the lower support member, Fig. 8.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Art Unit: 3711

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sokolov in view of Fujii.

The patent to Sokolov discloses a gaming machine comprising a cabinet with a first opening, a door 10 rotatably attached to one side of the cabinet. The door 10 opens and closes the first opening of the cabinet. Formed in front of the door 10 is a second opening 12. A frame 22, Figs. 2 and 3, is rotatably attached at one side of the second opening by a hinge construction. The hinge construction includes an upper support member arranged at an upper position in the one side of the second opening, and a lower support member arranged at a lower position in the one side of the second opening, 42, 44, 46. Separate shaft members 16, 18, Fig. 1 are rotatably supported in the upper support member and the lower support members, respectively.

The patent to Fujii teaches that it is known in the gaming machine art to use a hinge construction on a gaming machine door wherein the hinge construction comprises one long shaft member that is rotatably supported by an upper support member and a lower support member. In view of such teaching, it would have been obvious to modify Sokolov's hinge construction 16, 18, 42, 44 and 46 by substituting for Sokolov's separate shaft members, one lone shaft member. Sokolov's upper support member 42, 44, 46 would have had an upper support plate having an upper through hole, Sokolov's lower support member 42, 44, 46 would have had a lower support plate having a lower through hole. The upper end of the one long shaft would have been inserted into the upper through hole and would have been rotatably supported by the upper support

Art Unit: 3711

plate, and the lower end of the one long shaft would have been inserted into the lower through hole and would have been rotatably supported by the lower support plate. The shaft member would have been invisible from outside while the frame closes the second opening door. This modification would have made Sokolov's door 22 easier to maintain and replace.

5. Claims 2-6, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sokolov in view of Fujii as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bauley et al. or Kiesel, Jr.

Both the patents to Bauley et al. and Kiesel, Jr. disclose hinge constructions each having a shaft member (10 in Bauley et al. and 16 in Kiesel, Jr.). The upper end of the shaft member comprises a projection portion (34 Bauley et al., 20 Kiesel, Jr.). The projection portion is inserted in upper and lower support holes while being resiliently deformed to an inner direction (Figs. 3 and 4 Bauley et al., Fig. 1 Kiesel, Jr.). A guard portion (32 Bauley et al. and 18 Kiesel, Jr.) contacts to a lower surface of the lower support member. In view of such teaching, it would have been obvious to incorporate a resiliently deformable projection portion to the upper end of Sokolov's shaft member. It would have been also obvious to incorporate a guard portion to the lower end of Sokolov's shaft members. This modification would have made Sokolov's frame 22 more securely fastened to the door 10.

Art Unit: 3711

6. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sokolov in view of Fujii as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Baba et al.

The patent to Baba et al. teaches that is well known in the hinge construction art having shaft members, to make the shaft member 20 from synthetic resin. In view of such teaching it would have been obvious to make Sokolov's shaft member from synthetic resin. This modification would have made Sokolov's hinge construction less expensive to manufacture.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin H. Layno whose telephone number is (571) 272-4424. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 1st Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eugene Kim can be reached on (571) 272-4463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/695,937
Art Unit: 3711

Page 6

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Benjamin H. Layno". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Benjamin H. Layno
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3711

bhl